UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/580,381	02/23/2007	Tomohiro Kawamoto	81707.0200	2559
26021 HOGAN & HA	7590 09/22/200 RTSON L.L.P.	EXAMINER		
1999 AVENUE	OF THE STARS	HOBAN, MATTHEW E		
SUITE 1400 LOS ANGELES	S, CA 90067		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1793	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/22/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ctkeyner@hhlaw.com LAUSPTO@hhlaw.com lbrivero@hhlaw.com

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Comments		10/580,381	KAWAMOTO ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Matthew E. Hoban	1793			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>22 /</u>	May 2006				
′=		s action is non-final.				
′=	, _					
-	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
			,			
Disposition	on of Claims					
 4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) 1-12 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 						
Application Papers						
	Γhe specification is objected to by the Examine					
10) 🔲 🗆	Γhe drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)∏ acc	cepted or b) \square objected to by the ${ t E}$	Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
	(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4)	(PTO-413)			
3) Inform						

Application/Control Number: 10/580,381 Page 2

Art Unit: 1793

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-3, drawn to a piezoelectric ceramic composition.

Group II, claim(s) 4-8, drawn to a method of making a piezoelectric composition.

Group III, claim(s) 9-12, drawn to a laminated structure comprising the piezoelectric ceramic and internal electrodes.

2. The inventions listed as Groups I-III do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The technical feature connecting the three inventions is the composition of claim 1; however, this feature does not represent a special technical feature, since the subject matter of this claim is already known within the prior art. For example, Souza in his publication entitled "The effect of Nb doping on ferroelectric properties of PZT thin films prepared from polymeric precursors", teaches that PZT, which is not only ferroelectric, but also piezoelectric, can be doped with .05 mol% Nb (See End of Section 1). The resulting film comprises perovskite crystals containing Pb on the A site and Zr and Ti in the B site, wherein the amount of elements on either site adds to 1. In the situation where Nb is doped in the aforementioned amount, the average valency on the B site would be 4.005. It is also noted that the composition of claim 1 is also taught by Murata in EP1387417 (submitted in IDS) as can be seen in Table 2. Murata shows PZT compositions doped so that they have a valency of 4.006 or 4.009 (See Examples 11-14). Therefore, the teachings of the prior art show that the technical feature common amongst the groups is not a special technical feature as defined in PCT Rule 13.2, and restriction is therefore proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

- 3. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).
- 4. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

 Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

 All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process

Application/Control Number: 10/580,381

Page 4

Art Unit: 1793

claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew E. Hoban whose telephone number is (571) 270-3585. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:30 AM to 5 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jerry Lorengo can be reached on (571) 272-1233. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/580,381 Page 5

Art Unit: 1793

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J.A. LORENGO/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1793 /Matthew E Hoban/ Examiner, Art Unit 1793